

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 25, and 27 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 1-5, 10-18 and 23-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parise (USPN 6,114,834 & 6,792,259, hereinafter Parise '834 and Parise '259). The Examiner stated essentially that the individually teachings of Parise '834 and Parise '259 teach all the limitations of Claims 1-5, 10-18 and 23-31.

Respectfully, the rejection is an omnibus rejection of the claims without particularly addressing individual claims and lacks sufficient detail for Applicants to make a proper response. However, in view of the teachings of Parise '834 and Parise '259, at least Claims 1 and 23 are believed to be allowable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a rechargeable electronic device mounted in the charging device." Claim 23 claims, *inter alia*, "A charging device, comprising: a mounting device; and at least one laser source that emits laser light to a rechargeable electronic device mounted in the mounting device, wherein the mounting device comprises: a lower base; an upper base, wherein the at least one laser source is disposed on the upper base; and a plurality of walls that connect the lower base to the upper base."

Parise '834 and Parise '259 each teach a system and method for wireless energy transmission, and more particularly to a method for charging a battery powered motor vehicle. Neither Parise '834 nor Parise '259 teach "a rechargeable electronic device mounted in the charging device" as claimed in Claim 1, or "at least one laser source that emits laser light to a rechargeable electronic device mounted in the mounting device, wherein the mounting device

comprises: a lower base; an upper base, wherein the at least one laser source is disposed on the upper base” as claimed in Claim 23.

Referring more particularly to Claim 1; Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 each individually fail to teach “a rechargeable electronic device mounted in the charging device” as claimed in Claim 1. For example, the rechargeable device of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 is mounted within a motor vehicle while the charging device is mounted separately on a structure outside of the motor vehicle (see for example, Figures 1 of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259). Nowhere in either Parise ‘834 or Parise ‘259 is a charging device taught in which a rechargeable device may be mounted, essentially as claimed in Claim 1. In the response to arguments, the Examiner has suggested that “the garage is the enclosed charging device and the vehicle being inside the garage has the rechargeable battery.” Respectfully, the garage is entirely unrelated to the charging device. Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 are clear about the metes and bounds of the power transmission unit, which may be mounted to a pole, etc. Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 does not teach that the pole, or garage become part of the power transmission unit merely by virtue of being attached thereto. Therefore, Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 each individually fail to teach all the limitations of Claim 1.

Referring more particularly to Claim 23; Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 each individually fail to teach “at least one laser source that emits laser light to a rechargeable electronic device mounted in the mounting device, wherein the mounting device comprises: a lower base; an upper base, wherein the at least one laser source is disposed on the upper base” as claimed in Claim 23. Similar to Claim 1, Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 teach a rechargeable device mounted within a motor vehicle while the charging device is mounted separately on a structure outside of the motor vehicle (see for example, Figures 1 of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259). Neither Parise ‘834

nor Parise '259 teach a laser source is disposed on the upper base of a mounting device in which a rechargeable electronic device is mounted. Applicants respectfully reiterate that the garage is entirely unrelated to the charging device, and further that Parise '834 and Parise '259 are clear about the metes and bounds of the power transmission unit, which may be mounted to a pole, etc. Parise '834 and Parise '259 does not teach that the pole, or garage become part of the power transmission unit merely by virtue of being attached thereto. Therefore, Parise '834 and Parise '259 each individually fail to teach all the limitations of Claim 23.

Claims 2-5 and 10-18 depend from Claim 1. Claims 25 and 27 depend from Claim 23. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for respective independent claims.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 and 19-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parise (USPN 6,114,834 & 6,792,259). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Parise '834 and Parise '259 teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 6-9 and 19-22.

Respectfully, the rejection is an omnibus rejection of the claims without particularly addressing individual claims and lacks sufficient detail for Applicants to make a proper response. Further, the rejection fails to state a motivation for combining Parise '834 and Parise '259.

Claims 6-9 and 19-22 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-23, 25, and 27, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 26, 2007

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889